

§ 404.509 Against equity and good conscience; defined.

(a) Recovery of an overpayment is *against equity and good conscience* (under title II and title XVIII) if an individual—

(1) Changed his or her position for the worse (Example 1) or relinquished a valuable right (Example 2) because of reliance upon a notice that a payment would be made or because of the overpayment itself; or

(2) Was living in a separate household from the overpaid person at the time of the overpayment and did not receive the overpayment (Examples 3 and 4).

(b) The individual's financial circumstances are not material to a finding of *against equity and good conscience*.

Example 1. A widow, having been awarded benefits for herself and daughter, entered her daughter in private school because the monthly benefits made this possible. After the widow and her daughter received payments for almost a year, the deceased worker was found to be not insured and all payments to the widow and child were incorrect. The widow has no other funds with which to pay the daughter's private school expenses. Having entered the daughter in private school and thus incurred a financial obligation toward which the benefits had been applied, she was in a worse position financially than if she and her daughter had never been entitled to benefits. In this situation, the recovery of the payments would be *against equity and good conscience*.

Example 2. After being awarded old-age insurance benefits, an individual resigned from employment on the assumption he would receive regular monthly benefit payments. It was discovered 3 years later that (due to a Social Security Administration error) his award was erroneous because he did not have the required insured status. Due to his age, the individual was unable to get his job back and could not get any other employment. In this situation, recovery of the overpayments would be *against equity and good conscience* because the individual gave up a valuable right.

Example 3. M divorced K and married L. M died a few years later. When K files for benefits as a surviving divorced wife, she learns that L had been overpaid \$3,200 on M's earnings record. Because K and L are both entitled to benefits on M's record of earnings and we could not recover the overpayment from L, we sought recovery from K. K was living in a separate household from L at the time of the overpayment and did not receive the overpayment. K requests waiver of recovery

of the \$3,200 overpayment from benefits due her as a surviving divorced wife of M. In this situation, it would be *against equity and good conscience* to recover the overpayment from K.

Example 4. G filed for and was awarded benefits. His daughter, T, also filed for student benefits on G's earnings record. Since T was an independent, full-time student living in another State, she filed for benefits on her own behalf. Later, after T received 12 monthly benefits, the school reported that T had been a full-time student only 2 months and had withdrawn from school. Since T was overpaid 10 monthly benefits, she was requested to return the overpayment to SSA. T did not return the overpayment and further attempts to collect the overpayment were unsuccessful. G was asked to repay the overpayment because he was receiving benefits on the same earnings record. G requested waiver. To support his waiver request G established that he was not at fault in causing the overpayment because he did not know that T was receiving benefits. Since G is without fault and, in addition, meets the requirements of not living in the same household at the time of the overpayment and did not receive the overpayment, it would be *against equity and good conscience* to recover the overpayment from G.

[53 FR 25483, July 7, 1988]

§ 404.510 When an individual is "without fault" in a deduction overpayment.

In determining whether an individual is "without fault" with respect to a deduction overpayment, the Social Security Administration will consider all pertinent circumstances, including the individual's age and intelligence, and any physical, mental, educational, or linguistic limitations (including any lack of facility with the English language) the individual has. Except as provided in § 404.511 or elsewhere in this subpart F, situations in which an individual will be considered to be "without fault" with respect to a deduction overpayment include, but are not limited to, those that are described in this section. An individual will be considered "without fault" in accepting a payment which is incorrect because he/she failed to report an event specified in sections 203 (b) and (c) of the Act, or an event specified in section 203(d) of the Act as in effect for monthly benefits for months after December 1960, or because a deduction is required under section 203 (b), (c), (d), or section 222(b)

of the Act, or payments were not withheld as required by section 202(t) or section 228 of the Act, if it is shown that such failure to report or acceptance of the overpayment was due to one of the following circumstances:

(a) Reasonable belief that only his net cash earnings (*take-home* pay) are included in determining the annual earnings limitation or the monthly earnings limitation under section 203(f) of the Act.

(b) Reliance upon erroneous information from an official source within the Social Security Administration (or other governmental agency which the individual had reasonable cause to believe was connected with the administration of benefits under title II of the Act) with respect to the interpretation of a pertinent provision of the Social Security Act or regulations pertaining thereto. For example, this circumstance could occur where the individual is misinformed by such source as to the interpretation of a provision in the Act or regulations relating to deductions, or relating to the effect of residence of an alien outside the United States for more than 6 months.

(c) The beneficiary's death caused the earnings limit applicable to his earnings for purposes of deduction and the charging of excess earnings to be reduced below \$1,680 for a taxable year ending after 1967.

(d) [Reserved]

(e) Reasonable belief that in determining, for deduction purposes, his earnings from employment and/or net earnings from self-employment in the taxable year in which he became entitled to benefits, earnings in such year prior to such entitlement would be excluded. However, this provision does not apply if his earnings in the taxable year, beginning with the first month of entitlement, exceeded the earnings limitation amount for such year.

(f) Unawareness that his earnings were in excess of the earnings limitation applicable to the imposition of deductions and the charging of excess earnings or that he should have reported such excess where these earnings were greater than anticipated because of:

(1) Retroactive increases in pay, including back-pay awards;

(2) Work at a higher pay rate than realized;

(3) Failure of the employer of an individual unable to keep accurate records to restrict the amount of earnings or the number of hours worked in accordance with a previous agreement with such individual;

(4) The occurrence of five Saturdays (or other work days, e.g., five Mondays) in a month and the earnings for the services on the fifth Saturday or other work day caused the deductions.

(g) The continued issuance of benefit checks to him after he sent notice to the Administration of the event which caused or should have caused the deductions provided that such continued issuance of checks led him to believe in good faith that he was entitled to checks subsequently received.

(h) Lack of knowledge that bonuses, vacation pay, or similar payments, constitute earnings for purposes of the annual earnings limitation.

(i) [Reserved]

(j) Reasonable belief that earnings in excess of the earnings limitation amount for the taxable year would subject him to deductions only for months beginning with the first month in which his earnings exceeded the earnings limitation amount. However, this provision is applicable only if he reported timely to the Administration during the taxable year when his earnings reached the applicable limitation amount for such year.

(k) Lack of knowledge by a wife, husband, or child entitled to wife's, husband's, or child's insurance benefits, as the case may be, that the individual entitled to old-age insurance benefits on the same earnings record has incurred or would incur deductions because of a violation of the annual earnings or 7-day foreign work test, whichever is applicable, provided the wife, husband, or child is not living with such old-age insurance beneficiary and did not know and had no reason to know that such beneficiary's earnings activity or the income derived therefrom has caused or would cause such deductions.

(l) Reasonable belief, with respect to earnings activity for months after December 1982, that net earnings from self-employment after attainment of

age 70 (age 72 for months after December 1972 and before January 1983) in the taxable year in which such age was attained would not cause deductions (see § 404.430(a)) with respect to benefits payable for months in that taxable year prior to the attainment of such age.

(m) Reasonable belief by an individual entitled to child's, wife's, husband's, widow's, widower's, mother's, or parent's insurance benefits that earnings from employment and/or net earnings from self-employment after the termination of entitlement (other than termination by reason of entitlement to an old-age insurance benefit) in the taxable year in which the termination event occurred would not cause deductions with respect to benefits payable for months in that taxable year prior to the month in which the termination event occurred.

(n) Failure to understand the deduction provisions of the Act or the occurrence of unusual or unavoidable circumstances the nature of which clearly shows that the individual was unaware of a violation of such deduction provisions.

[27 FR 1162, Feb. 8, 1962, as amended at 28 FR 14492, Dec. 31, 1963; 34 FR 14888, Sept. 27, 1969; 36 FR 23361, Dec. 9, 1971; 43 FR 31318, July 21, 1978; 44 FR 20653, Apr. 6, 1979; 59 FR 1634, Jan. 12, 1994; 60 FR 17445, Apr. 6, 1995]

§ 404.510a When an individual is "without fault" in an entitlement overpayment.

A benefit payment under title II or title XVIII of the Act to or on behalf of an individual who fails to meet one or more requirements for entitlement to such payment or a benefit payment exceeding the amount to which he is entitled, constitutes an entitlement overpayment. Where an individual or other person on behalf of an individual accepts such overpayment because of reliance on erroneous information from an official source within the Social Security Administration (or other governmental agency which the individual had reasonable cause to believe was connected with the administration of benefits under title II or title XVIII of the Act) with respect to the interpretation of a pertinent provision of the Social Security Act or regulations per-

taining thereto, or where an individual or other person on behalf of an individual is overpaid as a result of the adjustment upward (under the family maximum provision in section 203 of the Act) of the benefits of such individual at the time of the proper termination of one or more beneficiaries on the same social security record and the subsequent reduction of the benefits of such individual caused by the reentitlement of the terminated beneficiary(ies) pursuant to a change in a provision of the law, such individual, in accepting such overpayment, will be deemed to be *without fault*. For purposes of this section *governmental agency* includes intermediaries and carriers under contract pursuant to sections 1816 and 1842 of the Act.

[39 FR 43716, Dec. 18, 1974]

§ 404.511 When an individual is at "fault" in a deduction overpayment.

(a) *Degree of care.* An individual will not be *without fault* if the Administration has evidence in its possession which shows either a lack of good faith or failure to exercise a high degree of care in determining whether circumstances which may cause deductions from his benefits should be brought to the attention of the Administration by an immediate report or by return of a benefit check. The high degree of care expected of an individual may vary with the complexity of the circumstances giving rise to the overpayment and the capacity of the particular payee to realize that he is being overpaid. Accordingly, variances in the personal circumstances and situations of individual payees are to be considered in determining whether the necessary degree of care has been exercised by an individual to warrant a finding that he was without fault in accepting a *deduction overpayment*.

(b) *Subsequent deduction overpayments.* The Social Security Administration generally will not find an individual to be without fault where, after having been exonerated for a "deduction overpayment" and after having been advised of the correct interpretation of the deduction provision, the individual incurs another "deduction overpayment" under the same circumstances as the first overpayment. However, in